DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 888 SP 007 863

AUTHOR Resurreccion, Richard L.
TITLE A Report on the Baltimore City Public Schools' Workshop for Teachers of Disadvantaged Vocational Students, Summer, 1973.
PUB DATE Nov 73
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Youth; *Effective Teaching; *Industrial Arts Teachers; Inservice Teacher Education; Summer Institutes; *Teacher Workshops; Teaching Procedures; Urban Teaching; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Baltimore City Schools; University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

To help teachers develop effective procedures for dealing with disadvantaged vocational students, the Baltimore City Public Schools sponsored a summer workshop in cooperation with the College of Education at the University of Maryland. As a result of this workshop, teachers were to a) become sensitive to the problems of disadvantaged students, b) recognize different value systems affecting behavior, c) become familiar with innovative educational techniques, d) learn to use effective instructional methods with slow learners, e) be exposed to the concept of team teaching, f) learn ways of improving the relationship between academic and shop studies, g) learn procedures that would minimize discipline problems, h) experiment with several instructional methods; and i) be able to write their program objectives behaviorally. Workshop participants agreed that the workshop met its stated objectives, that the instructional staff and resource personnel performed excellently, and that the workshop program should be continued. Recommendations for future workshops included greater participation by supervisors and administrators; representation at the workshops of labor unions and community religious leaders; use of field trips; and broadened workshop time, scope, and research. (HMD)

ED 088888

A REPORT ON THE BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS' WORKSHOP FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED VOCATIONAL STUDENTS, SUMMER, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by
Dr. Richard L. Resurreccion
Lecturer, Industrial Education Department

University of Maryland, College Park
November, 1973

SP 007 863

INTRODUCTION

The Baltimore City Public Schools' workshop for teachers of disadvantaged vocational students was planned and implemented through the combined efforts of the Vocational Division of the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Industrial Education Department, Institute for Child Study, and Special Education Department of the College of Education, University of Maryland. The central purpose of the workshop was to develop effective procedures and understandings for dealing with disadvantaged vocational students.

This report is submitted on behalf of the teaching and planning staff as an index of the success of the workshop. Inherent within this report is the expectation that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations will serve as a guide for the planning of future workshops.

Background of the Workshop

The workshop emerged from a concern by the administrators and supervisors of the Vocational Education Division to relieve the various frustrations faced by educators who work with disadvantaged vocational students. These administrators and supervisors felt it was necessary to change teachers' perceptions and classroom strategies in order to improve the learning environment. Thus, the Vocational Division proposed a workshop that would:

1. Assist educators in the development of a sense of unity and goal directedness, and an appreciation of

the problems of students in the inner-city;

2. Review innovative and exemplary instructional methods and techniques;
3. Provide consultation in content areas; and
4. Provide leadership in assisting participants in becoming better able to motivate the students they teach.

During the 1970-71 school year, Dr. Benjamin Whitten, Area Supervisor for Vocational Education, Baltimore City Public Schools, presented the idea of a workshop to Dr. Donald Maley, Chairman, Department of Industrial Education; Dr. H. Gerthon Morgan, Director, Institute for Child Study; and Dr. Jean Hebler, Chairman, Department of Special Education from the University of Maryland. These administrators, supported by selected staff members, met regularly to define and delineate goals for the workshop. The following goals were an outgrowth of their efforts:

1. Teachers will become sensitive to the problems of urban, or inner-city, or disadvantaged, or poverty students.
2. Teachers will recognize that there is more than one value system for behavior.
3. Teachers will study and plan application of innovative educational techniques.
4. Teachers will know and be able to use effective instructional methods with the learning handicaps of slow learners.

5. Teachers will be exposed to the advantages of team teaching programs to make lessons more meaningful.
6. Teachers will cooperate so that a greater relationship is attained between the shop and academic studies.
7. Teachers will know and follow procedures that will tend to minimize the causes of discipline problems in the classroom.
8. Teachers will experiment with several methods of teaching and develop units for instruction.
9. Teachers will be able to write their program objectives behaviorally.

The first workshop was held in the Summer of 1971 under the direction of Dr. Lowell Anderson, Assistant Professor of Industrial Education. The team also included Dr. Albert H. Gardner, Associate Professor of Human Development (Institute for Child Study); and Mrs. Susan Dhyse, Lecturer in Special Education. This workshop was limited to teachers from two vocational schools, Carver and Mergenthaler.

Success in the first workshop led to the Baltimore City Schools requesting a second Summer workshop (1972). A further request established an after school workshop which met regularly for 18 sessions during the 1972-73 school year. The third Summer workshop (1973) was an effort by the Baltimore City Public Schools to extend the achievements of preceding programs to teachers in other sectors of the school system.

The Workshop Goals

The original nine goals were used in the Summer 1973

workshop. Participants rated the workshop on accomplishment of the nine goals using a four point scale: 4, excellent; 3, good; 2, fair; and 1, poor. The participants' rating of the success of the workshop in achievement of these goals was high with an excellent majority rating for each of the nine goals. These data are presented in Table I.

Weekly Evaluation Sessions

Evaluation sessions were conducted each Friday in an attempt to give the participants, teaching staff, and Baltimore City School Supervisor, Dr. Ted Rybka, an appraisal of progress in the achievement of certain performance goals. Four types of evaluations were used. First, participant representatives verbally assessed each week's accomplishments. Second, the teaching staff followed the participant representatives, also using a verbal non-directed assessment. The third form was a verbal, spontaneous commentary by each participant, staff member, and the supervisor held on the final session. The fourth type was based on a high-low centinuum (four to one scale) indicating the degree of goal accomplishment in 30 main topics. Tape recordings were made of the three types of verbal dialogue and the essential information is contained in appropriate sections of this report.

TABLE I

Participants' Rating of the Success of the Workshop in Achieving its Goals

Goal	Rating Scale: Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	X̄
1 Sensitivity	f 14	3	0	0	17	3.7
2 Value system	f 16	1	0	0	17	3.9
3 Techniques	f 14	1	1	1	17	3.6
4 Methods	f 9	7	1	0	17	3.5
5 Team teaching	f 11	4	2	0	17	3.5
6 Relationships	f 14	1	2	0	17	3.7
7 Discipline	f 13	2	2	0	17	3.6
8 Instructional units	f 12	4	1	0	17	3.6
9 Behavioral objectives	f 12	5	0	0	17	3.7

Content was generally determined by the participants' common agreement with guidance from the teaching staff; a few areas were selected by the staff. The staff and supervisor attempted to serve as facilitators of learning as a means of meeting the needs in the forefront of the participants' thinking. The topics covered by the group were rated under 30 main objectives. These objectives included:

1. I have been able to identify myself as a participant in the large group discussion sessions.
2. I have gained greater insight into my "SELF" as a person during this workshop.
3. I have evaluated my values and attitudes which I hold and believe in as a teacher.
4. I have gained the security to risk exposing my attitudes and values by understanding other people.
5. I can apply the concept of "sensitivity to judging behavior" in my teaching performance.
6. I can differentiate between several methods of teaching.
7. I can apply the concept of cross-discipline planning to the development of my program.
8. I identified some problems common to the disadvantaged learner.
9. I can write behavioral objectives based on student observation and curricular concepts.
10. I can apply behavior objectives to the procedure of program planning.
11. I understand the concept of performance evaluation.

12. I understand the goals of special education.
13. I understand the meaning of the concept of "Career Education."
14. I see a need for planning educational experiences with parents, the community, business, and industry.
15. I have made some assessment of the value of vocational evaluation.
16. I can use diagnostic procedures to determine student reading problems.
17. I understand the procedures used in value clarification.
18. I have gained some helpful ideas for assisting students who have reading difficulties.
19. I can develop materials for remediation of student reading problems in my content area.
20. I have an increased sensitivity for the responsibilities of the principal.
21. I understand the recently implemented reorganization plan for the Baltimore City School system.
22. I can explain the services of Vocational Rehabilitation to interested faculty members.
23. I can list the major community services offered by the Department of Social Services.
24. I have a clearer understanding of urban renewal in Baltimore City.
25. I understand the apprenticeship program in the construction industry.
26. I have a significantly increased understanding of

drug enforcement and control.

27. I have clarified my understanding of the concept of sexuality.

28. I can identify several uses of the video-tape recorder in teaching.

29. I can list advantages and disadvantages of LAPS packages as a teaching procedure.

30. I rate my use of free time as

Responses to each of the thirty objectives are contained in Table II. It is important to note the high ratings for objectives dealing with self-perceptions and group membership, e.g., objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The lowest ratings (below 3.0) were in objectives 16, 17, 21, and 23. Item 21 was perhaps the most significant. The participants seemed to be confused by the reorganization of the city school system even after a detailed presentation by the resource specialist. This problem indicated a possible need for further clarification by the system's administrators.

TABLE II

Participants' Rating of Weekly Objectives

Objective	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
1	f 12	4	1	0	17	3.6
2	f 13	2	1	0	16	3.8
3	f 12	4	0	0	16	3.8
4	f 14	2	0	0	16	3.9
5	f 10	7	0	0	17	3.6
6	f 9	6	1	0	16	3.5
7	f 7	8	1	0	16	3.4
8	f 13	3	1	0	17	3.7
9	f 5	10	1	0	16	3.3
10	f 8	8	1	0	17	3.4
11	f 6	9	2	0	17	3.2
12	f 7	8	1	0	16	3.4
13	f 16	1	0	0	17	3.9
14	f 4	11	2	0	17	3.1
15	f 8	7	1	0	16	3.4
16	f 3	8	5	0	16	2.9
17	f 2	10	4	0	16	2.9
18	f 6	7	4	0	17	3.1
19	f 4	11	2	0	17	3.1
20	f 8	6	0	1	16	3.4
21	f 0	8	6	2	16	2.3
22	f 11	5	1	0	17	3.6
23	f 2	11	3	0	16	2.9

TABLE II (Continued)

Objective	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
24	f 3	14	0	0	17	3.2
25	f 5	8	3	1	17	3.0
26	f 13	3	0	0	16	3.8
27	f 10	6	0	0	16	3.6
28	f 7	7	2	0	16	3.3
29	f 4	8	4	0	16	3.0
30	f 8	7	0	0	15	3.5

The Teaching Staff

The teaching staff consisted of members from three different disciplines, Dr. Richard Resurreccion, Department of Industrial Education; Dr. Albert Gardner, Institute for Child Study; and Mr. Walter Savoy, Department of Special Education. A cross-discipline team teaching model was emphasized by the staff during the entire workshop.

Workshop planning, evaluation, and restructuring were continual concerns of the teaching staff. The staff planned a basic approach and framework two weeks prior to the opening of the workshop. This procedure included:

1. Discussions with Dr. Lowell Anderson,
2. Discussions with Dr. Ted Rybka,
3. Identification of probable topical areas and concomitant teaching strategies,
4. Identification of certain resource personnel,
5. Development of a basic outline with time frames, and
6. Preparation and purchase of materials and supplies.

Staff planning sessions were held prior to and immediately following each class meeting. Through these sessions the staff clarified and merged their perceptions, identified procedures for improving the learning environment, and refined the various objectives.

The teaching style may be characterized as indirect with a continuously evolving substructure. This approach seemed to be the most appropriate for establishing an organization based on democratic action. The outcome was a setting which stimulated thought through free self-expression and supported

and stabilized positive perceptions.

Instructional organization varied according to group needs and the type of activity. The workshop included total grouping, small groups, and individual discussions. Leadership moved from staff direction models to participant self-direction. A helping relationship was emphasized throughout the workshop.

Evaluation of the teaching staff was in four areas:

1. The knowledge of the staff member in subject materials, resource information, and understanding of subject areas;
2. The methodology used in presentations or working with small groups, individuals or the total group;
3. Planning of the workshop to enable maximum use of participant time in the workshop; and
4. The degree of understanding and sensitivity to the problems of teachers in the workshop.

On a four point scale, the staff received a 4.0 in categories 1 and 4, and 3.9 in categories 2 and 3 (Table III). The participants, both in their verbal and written comments, were pleased with the teaching staff and strategies.

TABLE III

Evaluation of the Teaching Staff

Categories	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
1 Subject matter	f 17	0	0	0	17	4.0
2 Methodology	f 16	0	1	0	17	3.9
3 Planning	f 16	0	1	0	17	3.9
4 Sensitivity	f 17	0	0	0	17	4.0

Resource Personnel

Resource personnel were used to increase the level of expertise in specific areas of group concern. The resource personnel helped expand the group's understandings in selected areas appropriate to classroom instruction, student guidance, school organization and management, community services, and community development. A list of the resource personnel is presented in Appendix B.

The resource personnel were rated in terms of knowledge, presentation methodology, and the amount of help which the participant felt he or she received. Participants were also asked to indicate "yes" or "no" to recommending continued inclusion of the various resource personnel. Responses of the participants were relatively high, except in school system reorganization (Table IV).

The Workshop Rating

Participants rated the total workshop on a five-point scale: 5, excellent; 4, good; 3, adequate; 2, poor; and 1, very poor. The mean was 4.8 (Table V). Reasons for this rating by the participants included:

1. Self-growth through self-evaluation.
2. It helped me to gain insights into my life as an individual and as a teacher.
3. Reached the recognition of sharing together intelligently.
4. So much help from everyone involved in the workshop.

5. Indepth questioning about individual student differences.
6. Developed inner resources to do what has to be done.
7. I know how to plan for team teaching.
8. All education is "special" education.
9. Reinforced sense of the value and worth of vocational-technical education and career education.
10. Understand for the first time the pressure under which principals work.
11. Free, open, and truthful.
12. The evaluative process.
13. Opportunity for independent study and research.
14. Flexibility of time and goals.
15. Excellence of resource people.
16. Instructors and their attitudes.
17. The particular content of the workshop and the manner in which it was organized by the discussion leaders.

TABLE IV

Rating of Resource Personnel

Topic		Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
1. LAPS Packages							
	K	f 10	6	0	0	16	3.6
	M	f 6	10	0	0	16	3.4
	H	f 7	4	5	0	16	3.1
		Recommend Unit		Yes 14		No 3	
2. Special Education							
	K	f 14	1	0	0	15	3.9
	M	f 13	2	0	0	15	3.9
	H	f 9	6	0	0	15	3.6
		Recommend Unit		Yes 17		No 0	
3. Drugs							
	K	f 15	0	0	0	15	4.0
	M	f 14	1	0	0	15	3.9
	H	f 13	1	0	0	14	3.9
		Recommend Unit		Yes 15		No 0	
4. Career Education							
	K	f 16	0	0	0	16	4.0
	M	f 16	0	0	0	16	4.0
	H	f 16	0	0	0	16	4.0
		Recommend Unit		Yes 17		No 0	
5. Apprenticeship Training							
	K	f 5	8	0	1	14	3.2
	M	f 2	9	3	0	14	2.9
	H	f 2	5	5	2	14	2.5
		Recommend Unit		Yes 14		No 3	

Table IV (Continued)

Topic		Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
6. Community Services							
	K	f 8	7	0	0	15	3.5
	M	f 2	8	4	1	15	2.7
	H	f 5	6	4	0	15	3.1
		Recommend Unit		Yes 14		No 3	
7. School System Reorganization							
	K	f 10	5	0	0	15	3.7
	M	f 6	3	6	1	16	2.9
	H	f 0	4	6	5	15	2.0
		Recommend Unit		Yes 12		No 5	
8. Urban Renewal							
	K	f 11	3	0	0	14	3.8
	M	f 7	5	2	0	14	3.3
	H	f 4	5	4	1	14	2.9
		Recommend Unit		Yes 13		No 2	
9. Vocational Rehabilitation							
	K	f 15	0	0	0	15	4.0
	M	f 12	3	0	0	15	3.8
	H	f 13	2	0	0	15	3.9
		Recommend Unit		Yes 17		No 0	
10. Reading							
	K	f 16	0	0	0	16	4.0
	M	f 9	6	0	1	16	3.4
	H	f 6	6	3	1	16	3.1
		Recommend Unit		Yes 17		No 0	
11. Sex Education							
	K	f 14	1	0	0	15	3.9
	M	f 13	2	0	0	15	3.80
	H	f 9	5	1	0	15	3.5
		Recommend Unit		Yes 16		No 1	

Table IV (Continued)

Topic		Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	$\bar{X}$
12. Housing							
	K	f 12	4	0	0	16	3.8
	M	f 7	6	3	0	16	3.3
	H	f 5	8	2	1	16	3.1
		Recommend Unit		Yes 16		No 1	
13. Principals							
	K	f 14	2	0	0	16	3.9
	M	f 9	5	1	0	15	3.5
	H	f 8	4	2	1	15	3.3
		Recommend Unit		Yes 17		No 1	
14. Students							
	K	f 13	2	0	0	15	3.9
	M	f 12	1	0	0	13	3.9
	H	f 10	5	0	0	15	3.7
		Recommend Unit		Yes 16		No 0	

K = knowledge of subject

M = presentation methodology

H = amount of help this person or these persons gave me

TABLE V

Workshop Rating

	Rating	Frequency	$\bar{X}$
Excellent	5	15	
Good	4	1	
Adequate	3	1	
Poor	2	0	
Very Poor	1	0	
	N = 17		4.8

Recommendations

One central theme ran through the majority of recommendations: the workshop concept should be expanded and become an integral part of the Baltimore City Public Schools. This point was expressed increasingly during the workshop and emphasized in the final written and oral evaluations.

The form of the workshop should vary according to the involved population. Thought should be given to possible year-round operation offered to past participants and other interested parties.

Other recommendations included:

1. Greater participation by supervisors and administrators,
2. Students for the duration of the workshop,
3. Representation from labor unions,
4. Representation from community religious leaders,
5. Reading strategies applicable to content areas,
6. Use of field trips, and
7. Broadened workshop time, scope, and research.

The teaching staff and participants generally concurred on these recommendations.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Jennifer Banks
School 40
Social Studies

Roy Clark
School 294
Painting and Decorating

Norma Cole
School 453
Business Occupations

Arnold Davis
School 401
Electricity/Electronics

Patricia Dickens
School 40
English

Arthur George
School 298
Science and Social Studies

Florence Handy
School 453
Business Education

Edward Johnson
School 406
Dental Technology

Branson Miller
School 40
Blue Print Reading

James Monaghan
School 40
Vocational T.V.I.

Frank Reed
School 298
Painting and Decorating

Minnie Reed
School 40
Industrial Sewing

Elvera Richardson
School 133
Home Economics

Edward Swanson
School 412
Drafting

Edward Thomas
School 181
Shoe Repair

Phyllis Thomas
School 133
Business Education

Benjamin Tillman
School 406
Machine Shop and Mechanical Drawing

Charles Witte
School 70
Mathematics

APPENDIX B

RESOURCE PERSONNEL

James Caskey
Baltimore Department of Social Services

Charles Chamberlin
Director of Apprenticeship Training
Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc.

Michael Colbert
Student
School 298

Dr. Elaine Davis
Special Administrative Officer to the Superintendent
Baltimore City Public Schools

Eric Davis
Student
School 453

Richard Davis
Director of Information
Housing and Community Development
Baltimore City

Milton Goldberg
Principal
School 453

Charles Henry
Baltimore Department of Social Services

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt
Professor of Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland, College Park

Dr. Linda Jacobs
Assistant Professor of Special Education
University of Maryland, College Park

Almeta Johnson
Maryland State Vocational Rehabilitation

Annette Johnson
Principal
School 40

Deborah Johnson
Student
School 453

John Meyers
Housing Specialist
U.S. Civil Rights Commission

Boyse Mosley
Vice Principal
School 406

Gary Probst
Assistant Professor of Reading
Prince George's Community College

Robert Schmitt
Principal
School 298

Betty Stein
Baltimore Department of Social Services

Helen Thrash
Volunteer
Planned Parenthood

Anthony Williams
Student
School 40

Stanley Winfield
Student
School 181

Joe Yabu
Graduate Assistant in Industrial Education
University of Maryland, College Park